

MUTP/98/4

On the relevance of the multiplicative anomaly

J.S.Dowker*

Department of Theoretical Physics,
The University of Manchester, Manchester, England

Abstract

We shed doubt on a commonly used manipulation in computing the partition function for a matrix valued operator together with the attendant invocation of the multiplicative anomaly.

March 1998

*dowker@a13.ph.man.ac.uk

In some recent works, [1–3], the multiplicative anomaly in the ζ -function definition of the functional determinant has been discussed from a physical point of view. In these calculations the anomaly arises when the field operator is matrix valued. For example, for two real free scalar fields of different masses, computing the functional determinant in two ways apparently yields different answers. The elements of the calculation are outlined in Evans [3] so, for convenience, let us refer to equations (1) and (2) of this work. The classical action is written in two ways

$$S_a = \frac{1}{2} \int (\phi_1 A_1 \phi_1 + \phi_2 A_2 \phi_2) dx,$$

where $A_i = -\nabla^2 + m_i^2$, and in matrix form

$$S_b = \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{\Phi} A \Phi dx$$

where

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} -\nabla^2 + m_1^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\nabla^2 + m_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Although trivially $S_a = S_b$, when the functional integral for the partition function is formally evaluated, two different answers appear. The reason given is that for S_a one naturally gets (we leave off standard factors and exponents)

$$\text{Det } A_1 \times \text{Det } A_2 \tag{1}$$

while S_b , gives

$$\text{Det } A = \text{Det } (A_1 A_2) \tag{2}$$

and these are not the same.

This last statement is certainly correct, and is a statement of the multiplicative anomaly. In this short note we wish to investigate, not this mathematical anomaly, but the step leading to (2). This equation appears in [1,2] where it is attributed to Benson *et al* [4] who state it without comment. Our opinion is that this relation is not obvious. It says that, when evaluating the functional determinant of A , the finite algebraic determinant of A can be taken first. The reasons why we find this to be unnatural, and even wrong, are as follows.

Firstly, the most natural, and the most usual, way of implementing the ζ -function method in the vector/matrix valued case is to take the vector index i together with the space-time coordinate x as a generalised continuous index. (This

has been a standard procedure, employed most extensively by De Witt.) It leads, in particular, to the split form (1).

Now, the functional integral formula for the determinant is an extension to the continuous, functional case of a standard finite dimensional formula. We can check (2) by considering a finite dimensional restriction. Thus replace the action by

$$S_f = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij\alpha\beta} \phi_{i\alpha} A_{ij\alpha\beta} \phi_{j\beta}$$

where integers α and β play the roles of the arguments, x and y , of the (nonlocal) operator A and have finite ranges. The multiple integral over the variables $\phi_{i\alpha}$ will then involve an ordinary determinant of the matrix A where the matrix indices are the pairs (i, α) and (j, β) , and this is the correct answer. For example, if the range of α and β is 1 to 2, then the determinant is a four by four one.

The argument leading to (2) now would give

$$\det_{\alpha\beta}(\det_{ij} A_{ij\alpha\beta})$$

i.e. one takes the determinant on the ij indices first and then that on the $\alpha\beta$ indices of the resulting expression. It is easily seen that these two routes give different answers. In our example, the second gives a sum of eight terms, each a product of four A coefficients, while the four by four determinant expands to 24 such terms.

Our conclusion is that if one uses the natural, and in our view correct, implementation of the ζ -function approach, it should not be necessary, at least in the vector valued case, to invoke the multiplicative anomaly, nor its specific expression.

References

1. Elizalde,E., Vanzo,L. and Zerbini,S. Zeta function regularisation the multiplicative anomaly and the Wodzicki Residue. hep-th/9701060. *Comm.Math.Phys.*, to be published
2. Elizalde,E., Filippi,A, Vanzo,L. and Zerbini,S. One-loop effective potential for a charged self-interacting bosonic model at finite temperature with its related multiplicative anomaly. hep-th/9710171.
3. Evans,T.S. Regularization schemes and the multiplicative anomaly. hep-th/9803184
4. Benson,K., Bernstein,J. and Dodelson,S. *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 2480.